

REMARKS

This application has once again been carefully reviewed in light of the most recent Office Action and the Rejections under Section 112 and 103 as set forth therein as well as the comments of the Examiner which have been duly considered.

The present Amendment is believed to overcome the §112 rejection and the single parent Claim 1 should now be clear of any indefiniteness and it particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter deemed patentable. Since Claims 4-8 depend from Claim 1, they too should be free of formal objection.

Claims 1 and 4 through 8 have been rejected as unpatentable and obvious in light of the Japanese Published Application No. 2-353U taken in view of the U.S. patent to Barbieri 4,004,362. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons noted below,

The Japanese Published Application 2-353 teaches connecting portions that are formed between slits 27. However, each of the connecting portions does not have a cutting line that is formed of perforations, as recited in claim 1 herein.

Claim 1 of our application features structure not suggested in the prior art. The positioning tab **24** and the tape body **4** are interconnected only via two connecting portions **8**. Also, the two connecting portions **8** are respectively provided on side portions of the end periphery **4a** of the tape body **4**.

A further distinction is that the two connecting portions **8** respectively have angled portions that linearly continue to laterally opposed end peripheries **4c** of the tape body **4**. This recitation has been added to parent Claim 1.

It should also be noted that each of the two connecting portions **8** has a cutting line **1**, i.e., perforations and also that the release sheet **12** has slits **S** that are formed adjacent to the cutting lines **L**. Note the emphasized recitations above.

It is the belief of counsel and the inventors that neither of the cited references teach or suggest the features claimed and discussed above.

The Japanese published application discloses a seal tape in which the slits **27** are formed between the tape body **24** and the ear portion **26**. Therefore, the seal tape, the tape body **24** and the ear portion **26** are connected to each other via connecting portions that are positioned between the slits **27**.

However, the connecting portions have no perforations. In addition, the connecting portions do not respectively include angled portions that linearly continue to laterally opposed end peripheries of the ear portion **26**.

Thus it will be seen that the connecting portions of the Japanese publication are structurally quite different from the now claimed connecting portions **8**. They do not correspond to the claimed connecting portions **8**.

Additionally, it is submitted that none of the cited references teach or suggest that "the release sheet **12** has slits **S** that are formed adjacent to the cutting lines **L**". In this regard the Examiner has alleged that it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the release sheet having slits **S** that are respectively formed adjacent to the cutting lines.

However, we believe that the Examiner must, in order to support such position, cite some prior art reference showing that the slits **S** can be formed adjacent to the cutting lines **L**.

For these reasons, it is respectfully urged that parent Claim 1 and all of the claims dependent therefrom are allowable and reconsideration is solicited.

As previously suggested, if the Examiner believes that a personal interview would be helpful to resolve any issues in this case, she is invited to call the undersigned counsel for the purpose of such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Donald L. Dennison
Reg. No. 19,920
Attorney for Applicants
Dennison, Schultz, & MacDonald
1727 King Street
Suite 105
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 15
ddennison@dennsionlaw.com

March 11, 2011